

Tilburg University

Consistent maximum-likelihood estimation with dependent observations

Heijmans, R.D.H.; Magnus, J.R.

Published in:
Journal of Econometrics

Publication date:
1986

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Heijmans, R. D. H., & Magnus, J. R. (1986). Consistent maximum-likelihood estimation with dependent observations: the general (non-normal) case and the normal case. *Journal of Econometrics*, 32(2), 253-285.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

CORRIGENDA

R.D.H. Heijmans and J.R. Magnus, Consistent maximum-likelihood estimation with dependent observations: The general (non-normal) case and the normal case, *Journal of Econometrics* 32 (1986) 253–285.

Professor B.B. van der Genugten of the Katholieke Universiteit Brabant in Tilburg has pointed out to us that condition (A.3) in Theorem 1, though sufficient for the consistency of $\{\hat{\gamma}_n\}$, is not necessary without further conditions on the likelihood function. This is due to the fact (in the notation of section 4) that the event $\{S_n(\gamma_0, N_0^c(\gamma_0)) < 0\}$ is contained in the event $\{\hat{\gamma}_n \notin N_0^c(\gamma_0)\}$, but not vice versa.

Thus, in Theorem 1 (p. 259, lines 8–9), ‘a necessary and sufficient condition’ should read ‘sufficient’, and the last paragraph of section 4 (from ‘To prove the converse...’) should be deleted.

In addition, condition (B.4) in Theorem 2 (p. 262) should be slightly strengthened and should now read: for every $\gamma \neq \gamma_0 \in \Gamma$ there exists a δ ($0 < \delta < 1$) and a neighbourhood $N(\gamma)$ of γ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P \left[(1/k_n(\gamma, \gamma_0)) \sup_{\phi \in N(\gamma)} (\Lambda_n(\phi) - \Lambda_n(\gamma)) < 1 - \delta \right] = 1.$$

As a result, the proofs of Theorem 2 (p. 264, lines 4–7) and Theorem 3 (p. 272, formula (7.16) and the four lines following this equation) have to be adapted in an obvious manner. Theorems 3–6 and the proofs of Theorems 4–6 are unaffected by these changes.